

HOW THE KING CAME HOME.

"Oh, why are you waiting, children,
And why are you watching the way?"
"We are watching because the folks have
said
The king comes home to-day—
The king on his prancing charger,
In his shining golden crown.
Oh, the bells will ring, the glad birds sing,
When the king comes back to the
town."

"Run home to your mothers, children;
In the land is pain and woe;
And the king, beyond the forest,
Fights with the Paynim foe."
"But," said the little children,
"The fight will soon be past,
We fain would wait, though the hour be
late;
He will surely come at last."

So the eager children waited
Till the closing of the day,
Till their eyes were tired of gazing
Along the dusty way;
But there came no sound of music,
No flashing golden crown;
And tears they shed, as they crept to bed,
When the round red sun went down.

But at the hour of midnight,
While the weary children slept,
Was heard within the city
The voice of them that wept,
Along the moonlit highway
Toward the sacred dome,
Dead on his shield, from the well-fought
field—
"Twas thus the king came home."
—[Chambers' Journal.]

THE FAMILY POCKET-BOOK.

BY T. E. WILSON.

I stopped for a friend, on the way to
my work, one day last week. His
wife called him back, and I heard her
say:

"Will, I must have some money.
We are out of—"

"Nearly everything, of course," he
interrupted. "I gave you \$10, Mon-
day."

"But I had to buy the children's
shoes, and pay for—"

"Well, here's \$10 more, and for
heaven's sake make it last till the end
of the week."

I had watched the life and bright-
ness fade out of her face since her
marriage, and had wondered at the
tired, depressed look that had suc-
ceeded it, at the fretful impatience
with her children that had clouded
over the old sweet and sunny temper
that never failed her young brothers
and sisters. Was this the explana-
tion? He carried the family pocket-
book, while she was the family quar-
termaster and purchaser, held to strict
account that everything should be in
the proper place at the proper time,
and in the proper way, but without
power to purchase, or to fulfill con-
tracts, or to provide for household
wants. Will is at the head of a me-
chanical department, and has been re-
ceiving \$45 or \$50 weekly for the past
ten years—a careless, good-natured
fellow, who would not listen to any-
thing for three minutes.

By chance, that afternoon, I was of-
fered a desk and book-case for about
an eighth of its value, and knowing
that Dick, the head of another de-
partment, receiving \$40 salary, had
said that he needed one badly for
work at his house, I sent for him and
proposed that he should take advan-
tage of the chance.

"I'll let you know in the morning,"
he said, "after I have talked it over
with my wife. I want it, but \$25 is
much too large an amount to take out
of my money, and I can't interfere
with my wife's."

"Do you and your wife carry sepa-
rate pocket-books?" I asked, as we
sat down to lunch. In explanation of
my curiosity I repeated the conversa-
tion I had overheard that morning.
Dick smiled.

"Of course we do. My wife never
asked me for a penny in her life—ex-
cept—for change, as you would ask
me."

"Would you mind explaining how
you manage your finances?"

"Certainly not. Just before we were
married, I heard Baldwin's wife say
that she intended to tease her husband
until he bought her a bracelet, and
that she bought a seal-skin saque with
the money she had taken out of his
pocket without his knowing it. That
set me to thinking. If my married
life was to have anything like that in
it, I should certainly resign. The
first day we were married, sitting on
the veranda, I proposed to my wife
that she should be Secretary of the
Treasury. She knew my income; I
told her of my expenditures, and gave
her my savings. She consented. It
was then and there agreed that I was
to have \$5, weekly, for car fares,
lunches, tobacco, drinks, and the like.
The remaining \$30 were to be the
family revenue, which she was to take
charge of, and with it provide for
everything needed, to the best of her
ability. Every Saturday night I handed
her \$30. When my salary was raised,
I took \$1 and \$4 were added to the
family fund. She governs and I reign.
I have no responsibility for the home
management. She plans everything,
provides everything, and attends to
every detail, large or small. I have
enough of that kind of worry in man-
aging that department of mine with-
out having to make up yearly estimates
for my household expenses, and to
prepare all the different household
appropriation bills. I am not qualified
to interfere or meddle with her ad-
ministration. I doubt if any man

could do that work even if he gave
his whole time to it, as she does.
Certainly no man can meddle without
marrying. The untrammelled charge
of the home is her natural-born and in-
alienable right as a wife, and any
interference on my part would be
quite as silly as her interference with
one of my paper contracts. She knows
quite as much about my business as I
could find out by two hours of daily
looking into hers."

"What do you do about presents to
one another?"

"We rarely make them. Once I
saved from my allowance enough to
buy her a watch for a birthday gift.
That money was a long time coming,
and I stuck closely to my pipe for
months. She was not happy at what I
had done, and frankly told me the rea-
son why. There was no provision in
our scheme by which she could do the
same. Then it struck me that while I
had the \$5 weekly for myself—say \$3
clear of necessities, charging the other
\$2 to the family fund for expenses—
she had absolutely not a penny she
could call her own. The \$30 was a
trust fund, managed for the common
good; and while she had an item in her
'omnibus bill' for our joint presents to
our friends, there could be no individ-
ual presents made by any one except
myself. I can't give myself a present.
She could not give herself a present.
If we took anything out of the com-
mon fund, by agreement then it was
not a present but an appropriation for
her or my benefit. I could make gifts
out of my \$3, but there was no possible
way by which she, as an individual,
could personally make a present to any
one. She had no privy purse as I had.
Everything of that kind was joint—the
firm's, so far as she was concerned.
Here I interfered, for the only time,
and insisted that \$2 should be set apart
for her private use as absolutely as
my \$3. Our little presents are made
from these private purses, and are not
worth mentioning."

"How does your wife get her brace-
lets and seal-skin saques, and all that?
Baldwin would be in a pickle if his
wife had your wife's chance."

"You are mistaken, I think. He
might at first, because his wife has
never been trusted; but not after she
grew accustomed to responsibility.
Women are naturally much more
economical and prudent than we are.
I have to insist upon my wife buying
such things out of the surplus, for she
wants to bank the money instead of
spending it. Women do not like to
spend their own money on ornaments,
though they will squander other folks'
money on them. Mrs. Baldwin never
felt that the salary her husband brings
home is not his nor hers, but the family
revenue, in which she had with him
joint, equal and unawarded rights.
All extra money I earn, aside of salary,
is spent for luxuries for my wife and
children. In the disposition of this
extra money I have equal voice with
her, and often veto her proposal con-
cerning it. If we can't agree, it goes
into the bank for my boy's school
fund. The extra appropriation bills
are the only ones I ever see or know
anything about."

"But is this not a gift from you?"

"Do I give her shoes and stockings
and bread and meat? The 'family'
provide these things alike for her and
for me. If Senator Jones votes for a
pension for some soldier's widow, does
he or the people of the United States
—of whom he is only one—give it to
her? My salary is a family revenue,
'held in usufruct' for its members, as
Herbert Spencer (echoing Thomas
Jefferson) would have the land held
for the living; and so are all additions
to it. The only money to which I
can lay claim is my \$5 per week. Be-
fore marriage my wife and I had in-
dividual rights to property, and these
were fused together in a joint estate
with joint rights. The marriage ser-
vice means something. Everybody
knows this to be true where land is
concerned. No one will purchase real
property from a married man or mar-
ried woman acting alone. Both parties
must unite in the sale to give it a
clear title. The same principle obtains
with salary as with land. It belongs
equally to both. My \$5 and my wife's
\$2 are our individual and personal
property held in fee by special grant
and charter from the crown to which
we owe allegiance—and it's not one of
Wild Olives'. Neither one has any
more individual claim to the \$34 than
Queen Victoria or Lord Salisbury has
to the \$100,000,000 yearly revenue
Great Britain receives from her tariff
on imports. Our home is a kingdom
—on a small scale. I reign, my wife
governs, and our \$40 are the revenues
for the support of the kingdom, out of
which we receive certain allowances,
and the revenue belongs to the family
to be spent for the general welfare."

"But you cannot dismiss your Prime
Minister?"

"Nor can Queen Victoria, without
consent of her people. Ask the two
little subjects of my kingdom if they
want another Prime Minister."

Since then I have had Will and Bal-
dwin to lunch, and I have drawn them
out on this topic. Neither had much to
say. Will summed it up in one sen-
tence: "If I don't carry the pocket-
book, I am not the head of the house;
and if I am not the head of the house,
I might as well go home to my Pa."
Baldwin was briefer and more logical:
"Women are condemned fools, and
Dick is a crank. Don't marry."

If Dick is not a "crank," why do
ninety-nine men out of every hundred
carry the pocket-book? There must be
some reason why he is alone in theory
and practice among all my friends.
What is it? Will the wives and mothers
tell us?

GRANT AND HANCOCK.

True Story of the Circumstances That
Led to their Estrangement.

Gen. James B. Fry, U. S. A., speak-
ing a few days ago of the recently-
published article as to the disagreement
between Gen. Grant and Gen. Hancock,
said to have come from a "well-known
Major-General," entitled "The Grant-
Hancock Tiff," said a similar article
appeared in a New York evening paper
a year ago, and that the statements
were attributed to Gen. Alfred Pleas-
anton. As Gen. Pleasanton was an
old acquaintance of Mrs. Hancock, who
felt much aggrieved by the story, she
wrote asking if he had been correctly
reported. He answered that the state-
ment had been made without his
knowledge, that he had never made
any such statements, had no idea who
the author was, etc. The Washington
correspondent who wrote the story was
taken to task by his editor, and replied
that Gen. Pleasanton did tell the story
"without solicitation and purely and
solely voluntarily on his part." The
substance of the two stories was that
when Mrs. Grant and Mrs. Hancock
were young ladies in society in St.
Louis as Miss Dent and Miss Russell
there was a marked difference in favor
of the latter in their social positions;
that the Russell family entertained
splendidly; that the Dent family did
not mingle in the society of the city,
but lived humbly and frugally; that
Miss Russell was the rich prize; that
Miss Dent became just a little bit
envious of the much-sought rich young
lady; that from this seed—envy—sprang
the Grant-Hancock quarrel; and that
said quarrel was precipitated at the
close of the War by Mrs. Grant forcing
her husband to give her revenge upon
the rival of her youth by turning Gen.
Hancock and his family out of quarters
and taking her into the house thus
vacated.

Gen. Fry says: "It is not true that
Gen. Grant turned Gen. Hancock out
of quarters, or that the trouble between
them was based upon any question
concerning quarters. There was no
bad feeling between them until 1868,
when Gen. Hancock, then in New Or-
leans, was over-ruled by Gen. Grant.
The difference that then arose was
official, and though it was subsequent-
ly aggravated by other official matters,
it was in time removed, and their re-
lations were thereafter friendly until
1880. While Hancock was running
for the Presidency in that year a
preacher by the name of Fowler pub-
lished an account of an interview he
had held with Grant, in which he re-
ported Grant as having said unkind
and injurious things of Hancock.
Hancock stated to his friends and to
the public that he could not believe
Grant could have been correctly re-
ported, and that Grant himself would
make the necessary contradictions. But
as that was not done Hancock
settled down to the conclusion that
Grant had wronged him, and they
ceased to be on speaking terms; so
they died. Their wives were in no
respect to blame for their differences.
Concerning the unjust fiction relating
to the early associations of Mrs. Grant
and Mrs. Hancock, the latter has said
to me recently: "This attack is untruth-
ful, wanton, and unprovoked. In it
some one has seen fit to sacrifice Mrs.
Grant for the purpose of placing me
in a false position. . . . The article
is baseless and cruel. . . . Our in-
tercourse [with the Grants] remained
perfectly cordial up to the New Or-
leans affair. I knew Mrs. Grant very
slightly before her marriage, which
took place in 1848. At that time I
was at school, but left the summer fol-
lowing. Nellie Dent, Mrs. Grant, was
a contemporary of mine. I was very
fond of her, as well as of old Mr. and
Mrs. Dent, who occupied as good a
position in St. Louis as any one, and
had quite as good claims, in my opin-
ion. They were hospitable people.
The family were not living out of the
city, but in it, very near to my home,
and I saw much of them."

Gen. Fry adds further: "As Mrs.
Grant was married and went out of
the young society of St. Louis in 1848,
and Mrs. Hancock was at school then
and did not enter society until 1849
and was married in 1850 when only 18,
years of age, there is no foundation
for the story of a rivalry between them
as young ladies which led to a quarrel
between their husbands in after life."

An Editor's Hard Luck.

A California editor thinks that re-
publicans are ungrateful, and, apparently,
he has reason. He says: "We wrote
up a whole paper of 'able articles'
about San Benito county—left nothing
to write about—printed 50,000
copies, lost \$275 on the venture,
knocked down a dirty, lying dog be-
fore we could collect what we did get,
broke our fist on the scoundrelly cur's
teeth, got blood poisoning, had three
doctors waiting on us, and didn't get
out of bed for three months."

A woman of Rondout, N. Y., is proud
because she has twenty-one different
kinds of lamps in her house. The
next thing in order will be a lamp
craze.

"BOODLERS" AT BAY.

Wardens McGarrigle and Varnell, and
Others, Indicted and Arrested
in Chicago.

Great Excitement.

The investigations by the special Grand
Jury called in Cook County, Illinois, has
already resulted in very important move-
ments. On Tuesday, the 15th inst., the
jury which had been in session only five
days found indictments against William
J. McGarrigle, the Warden of the County
Hospital; Harry A. Varnell, the Warden of
the County Insane Asylum; Edward S.
McDonald, the Engineer of the County
Hospital; Richard O. Driscoll, the book-
keeper for McDonald, and James T. Con-
nolly, book-keeper for Nie Schneider. All
of these men except Connolly were ar-
rested Tuesday night by deputy sheriffs,
and taken to the Sheriff's office, where
after the lapse of considerable time, and
owing to the absence of the County At-
torney, it was determined to hold them
until Wednesday. Judge Jamieson could
not name the bonds because he did not
know what the charges were. Several
persons were ready to go on their bonds,
but nothing could be done until Wednes-
day so the prisoners were taken to the
Sherman House where they occupied a
room with the deputy sheriff.

Connolly was arrested early Wednesday
morning, and all the prisoners at 10 o'clock
a. m. appeared in Judge Anthony's court
room, where the judge fixed their bail as
follows:

William J. McGarrigle, arrested on three
charges of conspiracy, \$10,000 on each
charge, or \$30,000 in all.

Edward S. McDonald, who is held on two
charges, the same amount on each, or
\$20,000.

Henry A. Varnell, who is also held on
two charges, was bound in the sum of
\$20,000.

D. O. Driscoll was held in \$10,000 bonds,
\$5,000 on each of two charges.

James T. Connolly was held on two
charges of conspiracy—\$5,000 on each.

M. C. McDonald, E. H. Lehmann, and
Commissioner Wren qualified and signed
all the bonds.

It seems that the suddenness of the ar-
rests was a great surprise to all. It was
not expected by the public that the jury
would be so prompt or early in finding in-
dictments. It is believed that this action
is only a beginning which will end in the
indictment and arrest of many prominent
County Officials including several County
Commissioners and ex-Commissioners and
numerous contractors as well as merchants
who have done business with the County.
"Boodlers" are evidently ill at ease, and
Chicago will doubtless witness before the
work is all done, a trial or trials that will
throw completely into the shade, the re-
cent "boodler" trials in New York City.
There is no disguising the fact that the
law and order people of Chicago and Cook
county are determined to push the in-
vestigation to the bitter end.

Of those already arrested the most
prominent is Warden McGarrigle. He was
formerly a Republican, but changed his
politics to become Chief of the Chicago
police force. Through his influence and
in consequence of information obtained
in Europe, the system of patrol boxes was
introduced in Chicago. He was a very ef-
ficient chief and so popular that he came
near being elected Sheriff of Cook county
in 1882. He has been Warden of the
County Hospital for a number of years,
and is a man of considerable ability. Ed.
McDonald, the engineer, is a brother of
M. C. McDonald, who has figured in poli-
tics for a number of years in Chicago.
Warden Varnell is a young man of ability
and prominence. Further arrests are an-
ticipated.

THE NEW RAILROAD LAW.

Applied to Passenger Traffic.

As this law is one of great interest to all
parties in the country, especially as affect-
ing passenger traffic, the following opinion
of one of the clearest-headed, general passen-
ger agents of the West will be read with
interest:

The provisions of the interstate com-
merce bill, justly and reasonably applied
to the passenger service of the United
States, can not fail to exercise a salutary
influence upon passenger revenues, its
leading principles being more readily
adaptable to passenger business and less
in conflict with the requirements of com-
merce, possibly, than they may be in their
application to freight traffic. Clear-
headed passenger men see no practical
evil which can result from:

1. Making all charges reasonable and
just.
2. From making like charges for like and
contemporaneous service, for like kind of
traffic, under substantially similar circum-
stances and conditions.
3. From affording reasonable and proper
facilities for the interchange of traffic be-
tween lines.
4. From printing and keeping for pub-
lic inspection established rates.
5. The strict observance of these rates,
and ten days' notice of any advance thereof.
6. From making the charge for a short
haul no greater than for a longer distance
over the same line.
7. From breaking down class distinc-
tions and according to all persons, firms,
corporations, and localities equal rights
under substantially the same circum-
stances and conditions.
8. From doing away with privileged
classes.

It is not probable that advances in pas-
senger rates to the general public will be
necessary. Whether the abolition of the
discriminations which have been accorded
to various classes of travelers will work
serious injury to commercial business re-
mains to be seen. If it does, the people
who will be affected will, no doubt, be able
to secure relief through Congress. If the
abolition or restriction of the dead head
charge results from a reasonable applica-
tion of the law there may be mourning in
many places, but the general verdict will
be one of approval. Take it all in all,
there is little or no harm wrought to the
railroads; hence the general passenger
agents in the western associations are co-

operating to ascertain what may be the
most "reasonable and just" interpretation
of the law, with a view to absolute observance
thereof.

WHEAT AND CORN.

Stocks of Both Cereals in the Country.

WHEAT.

Extended inquiries made by the Cin-
cinnati Price Current of the stocks of
wheat and corn held in the country March
1st show the following facts: In the light
winter wheat States on the basis of the pro-
duction of 1886 there was in the hands of
farmers, millers, and local warehouses, in
Ohio, 29 per cent.; in Indiana, 19; in Illi-
nois, 22; in Missouri, 18; in Kansas, 18; in
Michigan, 26; in Kentucky, 18, and in
Tennessee 17 per cent.—an average for all
these States of 22 per cent. For the spring
wheat States, the amount on hand is, in
Minnesota, 30 per cent.; Dakota, 23; Iowa,
17; Nebraska, 20, and Wisconsin 32 per
cent., an average of 26 per cent. This in-
vestigation further shows that, while in
1886 at this date there were 77,000,000
bushels, there are now but 75,000,000.
In the whole country it is believed that the
stock is 5,000,000 bushels less than a year
ago.

The requirements for consumption for
four months from March 1, and for spring
wheat seedling, will be about 110,000,000
bushels; this would leave 85,000,000 wheat
and flour, for export and for reserves at
the end of the crop year; 50,000,000 bush-
els is the minimum to place the latter,
which would imply a possible 25,000,000
bushels available for export during the
ensuing four months, on this basis, by re-
ducing the reserves to the minimum point.
It is possible, however, that a considerable
part of the seedling reserves have not
been counted in the estimates of supply.
In any event, the statistical position does
not suggest over 50,000,000 bushels avail-
able for export during the next four
months.

CORN.

The proportion of the 1886 crop of corn
on hand, unmarketed and not consumed,
in the twelve States mentioned, according
to special investigations of the Cincinnati
Price Current, is shown in the following,
compared with similar calculations as to
stocks a year ago: Shows in Ohio, 26 per
cent.; Indiana, 35; Illinois, 37; Iowa, 26;
Missouri, 25; Kansas, 30; Nebraska, 40;
Minnesota, 30; Wisconsin, 24; Michigan,
30; Kentucky, 32, and Tennessee, 38 per
cent., an average of 31, or 399,103,000 bush-
els in the twelve States, which added to
the estimated stock in other States will
make 548,000,000 or 150,000,000 bushels
less than at this time in 1885.

THE DEPARTMENT REPORT.

The March report of the Department of
Agriculture of the distribution and con-
sumption of wheat and corn shows that 35
per cent. of the crop is still in farmers'
hands, a smaller proportion than in March,
1885 and 1886, but larger than in 1884.
The estimated remainder is 608,000,000
bushels. The estimated proportion held
for home consumption is 377,000,000 bu-
shels, leaving 288,000,000 for transpor-
tation beyond county lines. The propor-
tion of merchantable corn is 86 per cent.,
making the quality of the crop compara-
tively high, 80 being the average percent-
age merchantable in a series of years.
The amount of wheat on hand is 27 per
cent. of the crop, or about 122,000,000
bushels, against 107,000,000 last year and
169,000,000 in March 1885, the largest
surplus ever known. It is 3,000,000 bushels
more than in March 1884, and 24,000,000
bushels more than in 1882, after the short-
est crop for recent years.

The proportion held for local consump-
tion is 194,000,000 bushels, and the pro-
portion to be shipped beyond county lines
263,000,000 bushels. The quality of the
crop is unusually good in the principal
wheat growing sections, the average weight
being 55.5 pounds per bushel.

THE PRESIDENT ALARMED.

A Strange Visitor at Oakview.

When the President completed his ar-
rangements for the purchase of his coun-
try seat near Washington the Superin-
tendent of Police detailed two mounted
officers, who were constantly on duty at
Oakview, in order that the family of the
President might be comparatively free
from intruders. Recently, however, there
seemed to be no further necessity for such
a guard, and the policemen were relieved
and put back on regular duty. Since Mrs.
Folsom left the cottage several days ago to
attend upon what proved to be the last
sickness of her mother, Mrs. Cleveland has
been ensconced in her cozy suburban resi-
dence, and she was joined every evening
by the President as soon as he could dis-
pose of business. Outside of the servants
connected with the establishment there is
no one about the premises, and the sole
guardian out of doors is an enormous
mastiff. One night last week, about the
time that the President and his household
were on the point of retiring, there came
a violent ring at the front door-bell, and
for a while there was great consternation
indoors. It was regarded as ominous that
the dog had failed to make known the
presence of a stranger, but finally one of
the servants mustered up sufficient courage
to answer the summons. A well-dressed
man, but an utter stranger to the family,
was on the vine-covered porch, and his in-
quiry was not for the President but for
the former occupant of Oakview, whose
name is Green. In explanation of his un-
timely visit the stranger said that he had
been absent from this part of the country
for several years and that he did not know
of the change of ownership in the place
where he had formerly been a frequent
guest. He was profuse in his apologies
when informed of the consternation that
his visit had created, and turned his steps
cityward very much disappointed. An
effort was made to keep the matter quiet,
but it finally leaked out, and the proba-
bilities are that in the future callers at
Oakview will again be compelled to run
the gauntlet of the metropolitan police.

Miss Nellie Arthur, daughter of the
late President Arthur, is visiting re-
latives at Savannah, Ga.